ACTA SCIENTIFIC NEUROLOGY (ISSN: 2582-1121)

Volume 3 Issue 10 October 2020

Review Article

Brain Organoids and the New Context of Bioethical Redefinition

Antonio Bartolomeu Jácomo Ferreira*

Instituto de Bioética, Universidade Católica Portuguesa, Portugal

***Corresponding Author:** Antonio Bartolomeu Jácomo Ferreira, Instituto de Bioética, Universidade Católica Portuguesa, Portugal.

Received: August 04, 2020

Published: September 16, 2020

Abstract

The development of the use of organoids, as well as adult stem cells, is the expression that the origin of the relationship between science ethics is complementarity.

The ethical challenge of organoids lies in the fact that their cells in their development differ and form structures related to those seen in embryonic tissues.

One of the challenges that bioethics faces in the area of organoids is the fact that today we are able to use cells in ways that we might not have imagined until a few years ago.

The consequences of using this technique in the animal model is the need to change the degree of ethical commitment in using the animal model. The enhancement of animal faculties.

In conclusion, scientific progress and the use of brain organoids, raises ethical challenges not seen in other forms of stem cell research.

On this article we claim that It is urgent to establish an ethical framework for brain organoids that can address relevant ethical concerns without unduly impeding this important area of research.

Keywords: Brain Organoids; Framework; Health Research

Introduction

Some of the biggest investments in the area of health research are associated with research in the field of neuroscience, especially in neurodegenerative diseases [1].

Following the ethical issues associated with his large investment, a theme takes on special relevance: the delicate character of cerebral morphology, associated with the core function of identity, implies a delicate invasive intervention. In view of these difficulties, an alternative source to the difficulty of intervening invasively in the human brain has always been sought. For centuries, the use of the animal model has presented itself as a safe, inexpensive and very effective possibility [2].

Despite this, the “sentient” condition of the animals has always been an obstacle to their use in research. This obstacle helped to identify a set of challenges no less problematic than the intervention of the human brain *in vivo*. European standards in animal protection legislation, associated with the ethical debate, did the rest [3]. The consequence was the development of alternatives based on the developments of regenerative medicine [4].

One of the most innovative forms is provided by stem cells, which can be used to produce brain organoids in the laboratory. Brain organoids are small collections of brain cells that organize themselves into structures that resemble parts of the human brain.

The ethical challenge of organoids lies in the fact that their cells in their development differ and form structures related to those seen in embryonic tissues. As the similarities between organoids and brains increase, researchers need to pay close attention to the potential for ethical issues. This innovative research tool thus poses a set of ethical challenges not seen in other forms of stem cell research [5]. We can easily sense that the evolution of the complexity of brain organoids is substantially more problematic at the ethical level than other forms of organoid evolution.

Since 20113, the team of researchers led by Lancaster [6] built the first human brain organoids from human pluripotent stem cells, demonstrating the ability to synthesize specific characteristics of human cortical development with an increased density of glial stem cells.

Figure 1: MA Lancaster *et al*. Nature 000, 1-7 (2013) doi: 10.1038 / nature12517.

One of the main promises of this tool in brain research was that, as brain organoids behave similarly to the real brain, they can be studied without the need to test treatments and therapies in living patients. To be a good model, the organoid will have to match an archetype as human as possible. This is precisely the central issue in the current ethical dilemma [7].

Good science that produces good ethics

The development of the use of organoids, as well as adult stem cells, is the expression that the origin of the relationship between science ethics is complementarity. “The most recent discovery in the area of stem cells, the so-called STAP cells, pluripotency cells induced by environmental stimulus, illustrate, once again, how the bringing of doubts and challenges to science, in an ethical way, resolving objections or ethical uncertainties has become a healthy exercise in good ethics and good science. Perhaps this evolution should be welcomed as promising for the future relationship between ethics and research, proving the stimulus (and not the block) that ethical reflection can bring to the researcher's ingenuity” [8].

Instead of embryonic stem cells, brain organoids are created using induced pluripotency cells. That is, by making the adult cells developed from a donor revert to the pluripotential stage making it possible to produce brain cells or neurons in the laboratory.

This pluripotential cell reversal method is not ethically innocuous, since in this way it relieves the ethical tension caused by the use of embryonic stem cells and the consequent ethical wound of embryo destruction.

When placed in laboratory culture, neurons replicate and grow, and with the help of a 3D scaffold-like artificial support structure, they begin a process of mutating into shapes similar to parts of the human brain, each modeling a region different from the human brain; the anterior brain, cerebellum and cerebral cortex [9,10].

Brain organoids respond to chemicals and pharmaceuticals in the same way as real human brains and are therefore a promising technique in the possible treatments of diseases such as Alzheimer's, Parkinson's disease and even brain cancer.

Bearing in mind the specificity of these elements, ethical evaluation does not fit into a clear category for the supervision of ethics commissions: they are not exclusively research with human beings; they are not investigations with animals or stem cells *ex vivo*. There is not necessarily a regulatory framework for organoids. This is not a terrible thing at the moment. But it is a gap that should probably be filled if organoids develop in such a way that concerns are more realistic. Ethics and science are working together to see if this specificity justifies the development of more targeted rules. Ethical discussions are progressing rapidly, well ahead of science [11].

Organoids, bioethics and futurology

Despite the growing number of articles related to this technique, the ethical debate has not followed it [12], having even suffered from a form of futurological contamination brought by the promises of scientific development [13]. Eric Racine draws attention to the need to distinguish between long, medium- and short-term challenges [14]. One of the first concerns is to think that we are growing small brains in a petri dish. This assumption frees our imagination to the idea of creating brains capable of thinking and feeling. However, this should not be the bioethical focus. We are not yet at that stage of the investigation. Even the most complex brain organoids lack the size, structure and interconnectivity of real human brains. Important cell types and blood vessels are needed to keep tissues nourished and healthy. They are extremely immature: a technique to stimulate their developmental age matched a fetus brain in the following quarters. In addition, they lack the ability to receive sensory information [15].

Brain organoids, like small clumps of cells, are only able to respond physiologically and molecularly to drugs or signals similarly to parts of the brain, but they are not brains.

The ethical focus should therefore be on other issues, such as the use of human cells to produce these organoids. We know that the evolution of the technique of induced pluripotentiality has meant that the question of the exclusive use of embryonic cells is no longer asked [15] in regenerative medicine or chromosomal mutation.

This issue is relevant to our discussion of the measure. Organoid research defies the so-called “14-day rule”, according to which no investigation with complete human embryos should use embryos older than 14 days [16]. Some Ethics Commissions identified this period as relevant mainly due to its close temporal connection with the beginning of neural development and with the embryo's distinct identity. The Warnock Committee specifies three elements: the human origin of the embryo, the possibility of suffering and the possibility of generating individualized human beings [17,18].

Researchers, like Insoo Hyun or Appleby, question the moral relevance of this rule for organoids [19,20]. If moral status is explicitly linked to the neural development of incomplete embryos, one can easily question the morality of the development and use of brain organoids in clinical investigation [21].

Another set of questions arise: who owns these cells? who are they for? what are we going to do with these organoids? Growing them in a petri dish is one thing, but the possibility of transplanting them to humans or animals is another. What will the consequences be?

The challenges to informed consent

One of the challenges that bioethics faces in the area of organoids is the fact that today we are able to use cells in ways that we might not have imagined until a few years ago. Stem cells are a proven valuable resource that cannot be left unused.

Given this assumption, it is necessary for science to exercise its full potential so that society can understand the use of human tissues in a way that individual consent for all possible uses is not necessary. It is a matter of trust. A position of trust in the work of scientists is urgently needed. This process cannot be one-sided, but scientists need to be trusted.

Consent cannot only be limited to research with biomaterials but must extend to genetic information. The question is how we ensure that people have sufficient control over the use of their fabrics and are protected.

Several models have been proposed, from the most comprehensive, such as general consent, in which all uses in research are authorized, to the most restrictive and dynamic, where the agreed terms continue to be discussed and negotiated, passing through general consent, but with specific exceptions.

Taking these models into account, the one that ethically best promotes autonomy is, in our view, the one that sustains continuous governance and supervision. According to this model, the donor is not approached about each research in which his genetic material is being used, but about what type of research is being carried out. It is a consent model in which each tissue donor consents, but there are checks and balances on the use of that tissue.

One of the main areas of therapeutic application of brain organoids is their use as test beds to understand how our larger and much more complex brains can react in a molecular way to different chemicals and pharmaceuticals. This possibility implies innovation in health and in the way new products are launched on the market, particularly in some other areas of stem cell science.

Cognitive improvement of the animal model and animal welfare

Until now, organoids in the human brain have been widely cultivated and studied *in vitro*. The novelty is that they are being transplanted into the brains of some animal species, especially mice.

Contrary to what one would expect, there was a peculiar form of synapses between human and animal cells. This discovery ends a pressing ethical question, since these animals have human and animal parts. Would human neurons implanted in a rat's brain cause it to become human?

So far, we know that mice have actually become smarter when looking at cognitive processing and memory tests. Obviously, we cannot conclude at the moment that this improvement means that they become more human, but there is a data that can have incalculable potential: through this technique we can make animals more intelligent, and, through that, facilitate the communication and the use of animals. animals for the benefit of our lives.

One of the most challenging consequences of using this technique in the animal model is the need to change the degree of ethical commitment in using the animal model. The enhancement of animal faculties, associated with suffering, for example, could lead to reconsider ethical attitudes preparing the way for a better consideration of animal ethics.

Conclusion

Scientific progress in the area of regenerative medicine and tissue engineering, using brain organoids, raises ethical challenges not seen in other forms of stem cell research. Given that brain organoids partially reproduce the development of the human brain, it is plausible that brain organoids may one day achieve superior cognitive skills. This technique raises difficult questions about the moral status of these organoids - issues that are currently outside the scope of existing regulations and guidelines.

It is urgent to establish a moral framework for brain organoids that can address relevant ethical concerns without unduly impeding this important area of research.

The balance between the benefits of research using brain organoids is clearly positive. Although the concerns associated with biosafety, if brain organoids are ever used directly in therapies, as a form of tissue transplantation, we will have to think again about the risks of introducing these cells in specific ways.

Bibliography

1. PhD in Philosophy and Letters. Master in European Studies. Degree in Philosophy and Theology. Researcher at the Bioethics Institute of the Catholic University of Portugal. PhD coordinator in Bioethics. Author of numerous articles and 7 books in the area of Bioethics and Neuroethics. Member of the Ethics Committee of Hospital Escola Fernando Pessoa; member of Academia Fides et Racio - Brazil. Integrated researcher at the Research Center in Management and Economics (CEGE - CPBS- UCP).
2. Ericsson AC., *et al*. "A brief history of animal modeling". *Missouri Medicine* 110.3 (2013): 201-205.
3. The protection of the animal model in research is conditioned by Decree-Law No. 113/3013, which establishes the rules for the use of the animal model.
4. Levin, G., *et al*. "Regenerative Medicine and Tissue Engineering" 14 (2019): 26-32.
5. Koplin JJ and Savulescu J. "Moral Limits of Brain Organoid Research". *The Journal of Law, Medicine and Ethics* 47.4 (2019): 760-767.
6. Lancaster M., *et al*. "Cerebral organoids model human brain development and microcephaly". *Nature* 501 (2013): 373-379.
7. Henry TG., *et al*. "The Ethics of Experimenting with Human Brain Tissue". *Nature* 429 (2018).
8. Carvalho AS. "Good ethics and good science: the path of stem cell research". Public (2014).
9. Yuen E., *et al*. "By implanting the organoids of the human brain in the rat brain, they grow faster and survive longer" (2018).
10. Hostiuc S., *et al*. "The moral status of cerebral organoids". *Regenerative Therapy* 10 (2019): 118-122.
11. Khara M Ramos., *et al*. "The NIH BRAIN Initiative: Integrating Neuroethics and Neuroscience". *Neuron* 101 (2019): 394.
12. Lavazza A and Massimini M. "Cerebral organoids and consciousness: how far are we willing to go*?" Journal of Medical Ethics* 44.9 (2018).

13. Attiah M and Farah M. “Minds, motherboards, and money: futurism and realism in the neuroethics of BCI Technologies”. *Frontiers in Systems Neuroscience* 8 (2014): 1-3.

14. Sample M and Racine E. “Ethical aspects of brain computer interfaces: a scoping review”. *BMC Medical Ethics* 18 (2017): 60.

15. Hostiuc, S., *et al*. (2019). oc., 118.

16. Hyun I. The embryo’s moral status is one of the most important ethical concepts in reproductive and regenerative medicine. Amy Wilkerson, Josephine Johnston, “Revisit the 14-Day Rule”. *Nature* 533 (2016): 169-171.

17. Hurlbut JB., *et al*. “Revisiting the Warnock rule”. *Nature Biotechnology* 35 (2017): 1029.

18. Warnock M. Report of the committee of inquiry into human fertilization and embryology: London (1984).

19. Hyun I. “Engineering ethics and self-organizing models of human development: opportunities and challenges”. *Cell Stem Cell* 21 (2017): 718-720.

20. Appleby JB and Bredenoord AL. “Should the 14-day rule for embryo research become the 28-day rule?” *EMBO Molecular Medicine* (2018).

21. Bredenoord AL., *et al*. “Human tissues in a dish: the research and ethical implications of organoid technology”. *Science* 355 (2017): 1-7.